

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On Romans ix. 5.

BY PROF. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D. D.

The English Version of 1611, as is well known, rendered this verse, "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ* came, *who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" As thus rendered, the verse has been regarded as asserting in the plainest terms the Divinity of our Lord, and has been used by theologians with much confidence and much emphasis in controversies with opponents. The Revised Version of 1881 gives a similar translation in its text: "*Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*" This Version, however, adds a marginal note in the following words: "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, and translate, *He who is God over all be (is) blessed forever;* or *He who is over all is God, blessed forever.* Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed forever.*" For this note, which is the suggestion of the Revision Company in England, the American Revisers propose to substitute, in accordance with the common form of expression adopted in such cases, the word *Or*, and to read, "Or, *flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.*" The New Version, thus, recognises the possibility of a different rendering from that which it still retains from the old one, or, at least, acknowledges that a portion of the scholars of recent times have believed such a rendering to be correct. The ordinary reader of the English New Testament is now, accordingly, put in possession of what his fathers did not, in general, know—the fact that to some scholarly minds the words do not appear to declare the Divinity of Christ, or to assert that he is God over all blessed for ever.

The renewed examination of a passage of so much importance could scarcely be regarded as unsuitable at any time. Certainly it cannot be so at present, when the attention of all readers is called to the words by the added notes of the Revisers in both nations. The

questions may well be asked, Whether the rendering of the Old Version ought to be retained in the new work; whether, if retained, it ought to be accompanied by a marginal note giving another explanation; and in what form this note, if added, ought to be expressed. The most important, as well as the most interesting of these questions, however, is the one first mentioned. Is the true translation of the words of the Apostle that which we find in the text of the Revised Version, or does some construction of the clause presented in the margin deserve to be considered as the one originally intended?

We should approach the consideration of this question, as it seems to us, first as verbal and grammatical interpreters alone,—asking, apart from all regard to St. Paul's doctrinal teaching, what the words before us most naturally mean, in the connection in which they stand; and only afterwards should we take our view of them as looking from the general doctrine of the Apostle. This is the natural order of examination in all cases. The words of a particular passage have a right to be interpreted by the common rules of language, and to have their meaning determined in independence of anything beyond the limits of their own context. A writer may not have intended to bring out, in a particular place, what he states as the substance of his teaching elsewhere. He may even have a different view of truth at one time from that which he has at another. We owe it to him to take and explain the sentence which he gives us to read, precisely as he gives it. This order, also, is the safest one. By following it, we are least exposed to those doctrinal pre-judgments which are so apt to make us all partial and one-sided in our dealing with the words of Scripture. But, while we look at the passage offered for examination at first in this way, we fail in duty, when we undertake to interpret a writer like St. Paul, unless, before our final decision, we inquire whether the meaning assigned by us to what he says is out of harmony with the Christian doctrine which he teaches.

Proceeding after this manner, let us consider the verse under discussion in view of its words or phrases, and their natural connection and construction. To which of the renderings are we led as the more probable one, or the only allowable one, when we pursue our inquiries in this way? For convenience in our comparison, we select the American marginal translation as the one to put in contrast with that of the text, reserving what may be said upon the other suggestions, in the English note, to a later point. We propose, also, to place the considerations favoring the translation in the text of the Revised Version first in order, and to follow them with some suggestions respecting those upon the opposite side of the question.

I. It can hardly be denied, we think, that ὁ ὤν is more naturally connected with ὁ Χριστός κ. τ. λ. as a descriptive clause, than with the following words as the beginning of a new and independent sentence. This construction of ὁ ὤν, in cases similar to that which is here presented, is the almost universal one both in the New Testament and in other Greek. In 2 Cor. xi. 31, for example, where the words ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας occur, as they do here, no one would hesitate to refer them to ὁ θεός which precedes, even if they stood at the end of the verse, or if the construction of the verse were so changed as to read ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. They would be thus referred, because the mind naturally carries back the participial clause to πατήρ as if a descriptive relative sentence. That ὁ ὤν followed by other words must always have this relative character, and cannot begin an independent sentence as its subject, it is, of course, idle to assert. Too many instances in which the phrase is used in the latter way may be cited at once, to allow any such position to be taken. Cf. *e. g.* Matt. xii. 30, Jno. iii. 31, viii. 47. But the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5, as compared with such passages, lies in the fact, that in the clause immediately preceding there is a prominent noun to which the phrase is most easily joined, and a noun, also, designating a person of whom a description in the way of praise might be readily expected. Under such circumstances the reader, as we cannot doubt, would find himself impelled to refer ὁ ὤν to this noun and this person. The writer would be aware, when he wrote, that this would be the impulse of every one whose eye should chance to fall upon his words. If, therefore, he did not design this reference to be made, he would, we must believe, have been careful to avoid the danger—we may almost say, the certainty—of it, by adopting another construction for his sentence, which would be exposed to no such misapprehension. Especially would this have been the case, where a misunderstanding would be attended with a wrong conception of a most important truth. While we admit, then, the possibility that ὁ ὤν opens an entirely new sentence, we think it cannot be denied that the *presumption* lies in favor of the view which connects this phrase with χριστός, and that the *burden of proof* is on the side of those who would reject this view.

This presumption and the consequent burden of proof are those which we find, at this point, upon the grammatical side of the question, and apart from the Apostle's doctrinal teaching. The fact of their existence is worthy of serious consideration, as we attempt to decide upon the meaning of the verse. Undoubtedly, however, too much stress may be laid upon this fact. Not only so, but it must be

admitted that more weight has been given to it by some writers than a due estimate of its importance would justify. There is, at the most, only a presumption in favor of this construction of the clause as against the other; and a presumption may be overbalanced by probabilities not yet considered. The grammatical argument may, perhaps, be compelled to give way before the force of what we discover on the doctrinal side. If, for example, it can be shown that St. Paul has distinctly, and perhaps frequently, declared that Christ is not God, we must cease to press this presumption. Dr. Liddon, in his "Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," page 314, note, says, "We may be very certain that if ἐπὶ πάντων θεός could prove to be an unwarranted reading, no scholar, however Socinianizing his bias, would hesitate to say that ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς κ. τ. λ. should be referred to the proper name which precedes it." But Dr. Liddon and all other competent scholars must be aware that the words which he supposes to be omitted, and on the omission of which the statement made by him is founded, are very vital words in the sentence. They are, it may be, the words which determine the true construction; so that, while no scholar would hesitate to connect ὁ ὢν with χριστός in case they were not present, every scholar ought not only to hesitate, but also to refuse to make this connection when they are present. The Apostle's doctrine as to the relation between χριστός and θεός, as we determine it from other passages of his writings, may prove to be such that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός cannot, by any probability whatever, be regarded as descriptive of χριστός. We say, *may be*—for we are assuming that, as yet, we have not ascertained what the Apostle's doctrine on the subject is. The grammatical presumption, to which we have referred, is not so strong as to be practically decisive of the question. This we frankly admit, and, in our judgment, it must be admitted. But such a presumption nevertheless exists, and it deserves notice as showing the probability as to the true construction of the words. We must, therefore, take our position at this point, at the outset of the discussion, and must allow, as we pursue this first part of the argument, that ὁ ὢν, grammatically considered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with χριστός, than as the subject of a new and doxological clause.

II. We turn now to consider, next in order, the phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. This phrase, by reason of the very limitation which it contains, suggests something of the nature of a contrast. If Christ did not have some other relation, or stand in some other position besides this one connected with the Jews, and different from it, there would be no

occasion for any such words. If He were in every sense and respect "from the Jews," the Apostle would, beyond any reasonable doubt, have said merely ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός. There is no instance in the New Testament where κατὰ σάρκα is used, in which such a contrast is not plainly intended. There will, however, as we suppose, be little controversy on this point. The main question as related to this phrase in the present verse is, not whether a contrast is intended, but whether it is expressed. In regard to this question, extreme positions have been taken by different writers in opposition to each other, and with equal confidence on both sides. The two parties have agreed only in one particular. They have both asserted that the answer is determined *decisively* by the mere presence of the phrase itself.

On the one hand, it is maintained that the expression τὸ κατὰ σάρκα requires as an antithesis a reference to Christ's divine nature, (so *e. g.* Lange), and thus ὁ ὢν κ. τ. λ., which are the only words in the passage that can set forth the antithesis, must necessarily contain it. We cannot believe that this assertion, as declaring such a necessity, can be established. There are several examples of the use of κατὰ σάρκα without any added expression of this character, in the Pauline Epistles. One of these is in the immediate context of this verse; namely, in Rom. ix. 3, where the Apostle speaks of the Israelites as his *kinsmen according to the flesh*, and yet says nothing of them in any other and contrasted relation. As for τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, no instance of its use outside of the verse before us occurs either in the writings of St. Paul, or in any of the other New Testament books.* But there are such instances in other Greek writings, where it is plain that there is no expressed antithesis. A very noticeable one—noticeable by reason of the striking similarity of the language to that which the Apostle here employs—is found in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, chap. xxxii. In speaking of Jacob, Clement says ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. Whatever contrast may be implied here, none is set forth in words by the author. These examples of the use of κατὰ σάρκα, either with or without the neuter article, are sufficient to show that there is no necessity appertaining to the laws of the Greek language, and none arising from any inevitable obscurity of thought as involved in such a phrase without it, for a distinct expression of the intended antithesis. Some writers, however, who are not disposed to go so far as to assert that the phrase *must*, when referring to Christ, have the contrast *always* supplied in words, affirm that it cannot be otherwise *here*. Thus Philippi says, "The suppression of the anti-

* The textual reading in Acts ii. 30, which includes these words, should doubtless be rejected.

thesis, and its supply in thought merely, cannot take place where, as here, the thesis occurs only for the sake of the antithesis. "*τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*," he adds, "stands merely for the sake of the following *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. Without this contrast the words would imply a diminution of the prerogative of Israel. The Apostle would then have written simply *καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός*; for that the Messiah springs from the Jews is a higher privilege than that He springs from them after the flesh merely. But that *He* springs from them after the flesh who is God over all, this is the highest conceivable prerogative." If we were considering probabilities only, this reasoning would have much force. But it must be borne in mind that the words of Philippi include a *cannot*, and claim a *necessity* as existing. That *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* is inserted because Christ had another relation, in which he did not belong to the Jewish race, may be admitted. This admission, however, is far from being the same thing as to say, that this relation must be set forth in the words *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. How do we know that the Apostle did not add the limiting phrase simply because he and his readers appreciated the fact, that the Messiah was not from the Jews in every sense? How do we know that he intended to define particularly what he was in other respects? How do we determine—not that he may, or probably does—but that he *must* give to his sentence this especial emphasis of which Philippi speaks, or that he intends to assign to the Jews "the highest conceivable prerogative?" Those who affirm that the phrase itself renders it absolutely certain that the words *ὁ ὤν κ. τ. λ.* are antithetical to it, are assuming a ground which, as we think, cannot be successfully defended.

In direct opposition to the writers of the class just alluded to, the learned Dutch scholar, van Hengel, in an extended note in his Commentary on this Epistle, endeavors to prove that, according to Greek usage *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* here requires a period to be placed after it, and thus the following words must begin a new sentence. His position is that *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* must be distinguished from *κατὰ σάρκα*, and that, when the neuter article is thus used with a restrictive phrase, the appropriate direct contrast is suggested by and involved in this phrase, and any further antithesis is excluded. This position seems to us indefensible, if it amounts to a declaration that a writer, after using *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, cannot state in words what the person to whom he is referring is *τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα*. Do not the passages cited by Meyer, in his notes on this verse,—namely, Xenophon's Cyr. v. 4, 11, (*νῦν τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οἴχομαι, τὸ δ' ἐπί σοι σέσωσμαι*), Plato, Minos, 320 C., (*νομωφύλακι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐχρῆτο ὁ Μίνως κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην*

Κρήτην τῷ Τάλῳ), sufficiently prove the opposite? It also seems indefensible, if it involves the assertion that, though the Apostle might have expressed the contrast here by a phrase including *τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα*, he could not have set it forth without these words, provided that he desired to use other phraseology giving in substance the same idea. Language is not bound in cast-iron chains. Certainly the language of St. Paul is not. But it is not necessary to enter upon a prolonged discussion respecting this point. If we admit everything which this distinguished commentator can possibly intend to maintain, the question is not settled, as he supposes it to be. There may not be here any such distinct (*τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα*) contrast as van Hengel is excluding. The Apostle may be—not to say, is—stating not what Christ is on the *σάρξ* and on the *πνεῦμα* side, *i. e.* giving a description of Him in his two natures or relations, but simply that Christ, who is God over all, came from the Jews *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*. Could he not have said, Christ, who is the Son of God, or who is the Saviour of the world, came from the Jews *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*? If he had desired to lay an especial emphasis on the clause beginning with *who is* in this latter sentence, could he not have placed it after *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, instead of before these words? If he could, he could do the same thing in the case before us. This, as we believe, is precisely what he intended to do. But even the possibility that this view of his purpose is correct proves that no such argument as that of this Dutch writer is conclusive.*

We are thrown back, therefore—on both sides—upon probabilities, and must pursue our examination accordingly. In order to determine what these probabilities are, however, we must observe what the author is attempting to do in the verses to which this passage belongs. It is evident that his object is to set forth the privileges and honors of the Israelitish people, in which he as a Jew might naturally

*If the reading of the Textus Receptus in Acts ii. 30 were adopted—*εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν χριστὸν, καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ*—could not the words *τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν* have been added to *χριστόν* by the author? Would he, because of the presence of *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* have been compelled by the inviolable laws of the Greek language to omit these words, however greatly he desired to insert them in his sentence? We cannot believe that the language is fettered so closely as this. But if it is thus limited, so far as the setting forth of a direct contrast is concerned, it will not follow that there is a similar limitation with reference to such a phrase as the one before us, when introduced for the purpose indicated above.

glory, as an evidence that, in anything which he was about to say respecting them, he was moved by no feeling of hostility. These honors and privileges he brings before the reader in a series of terms, which are clearly arranged in an order of climax. At the end of the series is mentioned, as the greatest and highest distinction of his nation, the fact that Christ belonged to them in a certain sense or on a certain side,—*τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*. So far there can be no difference of opinion. The Apostle's position is plain. But if this be so, is it not antecedently probable, that—in case he could point out, on the *πνεῦμα* side, some peculiar glory appertaining to Christ, which would serve to show in the most emphatic way what the honor to the Jews of having him appear as one of themselves was—he would for the very purpose of his climax, suggest it to the reader's mind? We cannot doubt that an affirmative answer to this question must be given. If, however, the *ὁ ὤν* clause is referred to Christ, as descriptive of Him, it contains just such a statement of His exalted position as would, in the highest degree, serve this purpose. It presents the honor divinely bestowed upon the people as nothing else could do; such honor as might well lead the Apostle to the extraordinary expression of devotion to them which we find two verses earlier. On the other hand, the insertion of an independent sentence ascribing praise to God the Father here, whatever may be said as to the possible fitness of such a sentence in this context, deprives the passage of this emphasis of climax, if we may so speak, which the author appears to be aiming at as one of his main objects.

We are considering the words, it must be remembered, in connection with the rules of language and grammar, at present. Looking at the sentence in this way, we may say, (*a.*) *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* naturally and necessarily suggests the idea of contrast; (*b.*) this contrast, though, indeed, it may not always be expressed, will probably be expressed whenever the thought can be brought out more clearly or more impressively by this means; (*c.*) in the present case, it is evident that the greatest force is given to the words, if the antithesis is distinctly stated; (*d.*) therefore, in this case, the phrase *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* throws the presumption in favor of the view which holds that we have a statement of the antithesis within the sentence; (*e.*) inasmuch as the clause *ὁ ὤν κ. τ. λ.* may be interpreted in such a way as to answer the purpose of an antithesis (even expressing it in the manner best adapted to the carrying out of a design which the writer manifestly has in mind), and inasmuch as there is nothing else in the verses which can answer this purpose, the probability is that this clause does express what *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* suggests or calls for.

This probability, we readily confess, is not so strong that it might not be over-balanced by the clear teaching of the Apostle, if such could be proved, that Christ is not *θεός*. Nor is it so strong, that it would be impossible to suppose an *unexpressed* contrast had been in the writer's mind—such, for example, as that, while on the *σάρξ* side Christ came from the Jews only, on the *πνεῦμα* side he had relation to Jews and Gentiles alike.* The probability, that is to say, does not reach the limits of certainty. But it is of such strength as to be worthy, as we have already said of that which exists respecting the

*That the unexpressed contrast here referred to is not the one intended by the Apostle, we think is rendered altogether probable by the following considerations: (*a*.) In the passage of this Epistle in which the *πνεῦμα* side or relation of Christ is mentioned most distinctly, in contrast with the *σάρξ* side or relation,—namely, Chap. i., vss. 3, 4, a radically different sense belongs to *πνεῦμα*. That passage, however, as it appears to us, is one in which the Apostle would have been more inclined, than he would be here, to bring out the relation of the Lord Jesus to all men, in contrast to that in which he stood to the Jews alone. He was there speaking of the Gospel and its proclamation to all the nations. He was intimating that the Old Testament Scriptures had promised and prophesied it; a point which he subsequently develops as confirming the doctrine of salvation by faith for Jews and Gentiles alike. To refer, under such circumstances, to Christ's relation to both would not have been outside of the line of his thought. But in the verses before us he is confining himself to the Jews only, and is attempting to meet a special difficulty as connected with the covenant of God, which made them earnestly oppose his doctrine. In order to carry out his purpose, he is enumerating their privileges as a nation and the marked evidences of God's favor towards them. It is to them exclusively that his thoughts turn here, though they have turned to others elsewhere. If, in such a context, he says, Christ, who is in himself Divine, is, by his human descent, from the Jews, it is in full harmony with all that he is thus setting forth. But a reference, even by implication, to Christ's spiritual connection with all men, as distinguished from them alone, seems to break in discordantly upon his recital of their peculiar honors, and his defence of himself against their sensitiveness. (*b*). Whatever we may hold with respect to the doctrine of His Deity, we cannot but regard it as evident that, in general, when the *πνεῦμα* side of Christ is spoken of or hinted at in the New Testament, in distinction from the *σάρξ* side, the reference is to something internal to himself, or belonging to his relations to God, and not to what is external, appertaining to the connection which he has with all men as opposed to that which he has with the Jewish race.

construction of ὁ ὤν, of very serious consideration. It passes the *burden of proof* over to the opposite view.

We cannot but regard the probabilities developed thus far in the discussion as cumulative. If what has been said (in Section I.) of ὁ ὤν is of weight, the probability that the clause beginning with those words stands in a certain contrast to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is strengthened by this fact.

III. The next point which demands our attention is the position in the sentence of the word εὐλογητός. This word occurs just where we should expect to find it, provided the clause is descriptive of Χριστός, but it does not have the place in the order of the sentence which it regularly holds in doxologies. A new probability in favor of making the clause a descriptive relative one is derived from this fact.

To say, indeed, as many authors have done in the discussion of this verse, that this word, εὐλογητός, cannot possibly stand anywhere in a doxological sentence of this character except at the beginning, is to take an extreme position. It requires much boldness, as it seems to us, to affirm, in respect to such a matter, what a writer *must* say, or to declare what does not fall within the limits of possibility. Language rises above rules at times. In some cases the form of expression may depend, even to the violation of ordinary principles, on the peculiar shade of thought or point of view which characterizes a writer's mind at the moment. Especially may this be the case where the question is one of emphasis, and where emphasis is connected closely, as it is in the Greek language, with the arrangement of words.

But, setting aside the question of absolute impossibility in any conceivable case, the ordinary rule of the language undoubtedly is, that, in doxologies of an exclamatory character, and of this form, the doxological word has the first place. This rule is observed by all the writers in the New Testament and Old Testament, and in the O. T. Apocryphal books, who use such sentences at all, and, among others, by St. Paul himself. This rule seems, also, to be founded in reason, for it is in the very nature of such a sentence to put the exclamation at the beginning. The fact of the rule, (or custom, if so it be called), and of its reasonableness will scarcely be questioned, and therefore need not be proved. The only point to be determined is, whether there are exceptions, which show that, after all, the whole matter is dependent on mere chance emphasis in each particular case —so that the doxological word may have any position; but ordi-

narily has the first simply because, in ordinary cases, the main emphasis rests upon it.

The only exceptional case which is cited from the Scriptures by most writers, is Psalm lxvii. 20, in the Septuagint Version. We are convinced that this passage constitutes no proper exception to the rule, and that it has no bearing upon Rom. ix. 5. We do not say this, indeed, because of the reason which is urged by many ; namely, that the LXX. translators misinterpreted the Hebrew. This we regard as no satisfactory account of the matter. They may have failed to understand the Hebrew, but they were familiar, doubtless, with Greek usage respecting such sentences ; and their arrangement of the words is a thing wholly within the domain of the Greek language. The fact remains that, in a Greek sentence, they have put εὐλογητός in another than the first place.* But when we examine this passage closely, we find that it differs from ordinary doxologies in an important particular. It is a two-fold sentence, having a double or repeated doxology, such as does not occur elsewhere, either in the Old Testament or the New. The verse reads in the LXX., κύριος ὁ θεὸς

* The peculiarity of this verse in the Septuagint is supposed by Schultz, who favors the reference of Rom. ix. 5, to Christ, and is admitted by Grimm, who opposes this reference, to be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew after the following manner. The Hebrew suggests as the true translation, Thou hast gone up to the high place, thou hast captured a captivity, thou hast taken gifts among mankind and even among rebels,—to dwell as Jah, God. Blessed be the Lord day by day. The LXX. translators, not comprehending the meaning, rendered the words with a slavish literality and adherence to the Hebrew order, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός—κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. Being unable, with this reading of the sentence, to connect the phrase κύριος ὁ θεός with what precedes, they concluded that it must be connected with εὐλογητός as a doxology ; and, accordingly, they inserted another εὐλογητός to meet the necessity of a verbal word for the second κύριος. This explanation is, perhaps, the most satisfactory one which can be given. But, if it be adopted, we must notice that it involves the supposition that the LXX. translators, when they failed to understand the verse in the original, considered with some carefulness what they could do with it, and only after such consideration inserted the second doxological word. They, thus, deliberately arranged a Greek sentence in this order ; and, accordingly, we must hold that they felt the order to be not forbidden by the rules of the language. For this reason, as it appears to us, the mere statement that the Seventy misinterpreted the Hebrew is not sufficient to account for their arrangement of the words in this verse of the Psalms.

εὐλογητὸς, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. In double sentences of this kind, there is an altogether peculiar rule of emphasis, which conflicts with, and may overpower, the rule prevailing in single exclamatory clauses. The rule to which we refer is, that, in such cases, the two parts of the sentence are so arranged that the corresponding or contrasted words are placed either at the end of the first and beginning of the second part; or at the beginning of the first and end of the second. The frequency with which this rule is observed by Greek writers will not have escaped the notice of any one who is familiar with their works. It is observed, as we may not doubt, by the LXX. translators here. Their desire was to set forth the emphasis on εὐλογητός in this passage in the strongest way. How could they best accomplish this end? How could they, in the twofold sentence with its parallel clauses, give to the doxological words that prominence which in a single exclamatory sentence is secured by placing it at the beginning? Evidently, by arranging the clauses precisely as they have done. For this reason, as we may believe, they adopted this method; and, in adopting it, they sought to bring out what in single clauses they attained in another way. If they had translated the Hebrew accurately, with only one doxology, they would, doubtless, have expressed the emphasis as the Hebrew does in this verse, and as they themselves do everywhere else in the Psalms, by placing εὐλογητός at the beginning. So far, then, from being an exception which proves that the doxological word may stand after the subject of the sentence, as Winer and others maintain, this verse from the Septuagint, in our judgment, strengthens the opposite view, inasmuch as it shows that, even in this peculiar case, this word is made to have the greatest possible prominence.*

* In contrast with those who would make Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept., a case in proof of the application of εὐλογητός in an exclamatory doxology to a subject which precedes it, Lange and Canon Farrar hold that St. Paul, in our present verse, is only echoing the passage from the Psalms and using it to set forth the exaltation of Christ. They found their opinion on the fact that, in Eph. iv. 8, the Apostle cites a part of the next preceding verse, (Thou hast ascended on high, &c.), in reference to him. "Do we not plainly hear the reëcho of this passage," says Lange, "in the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων? And since we know that Paul applies this passage to the glorification of Christ, is it not clear that he immediately adds that ascription of praise in the Psalm? His expression occupies the middle ground between the LXX. and the Hebrew text." This reasoning seems to be inconclusive. The apostle, undoubtedly, uses the words of Ps. lxvii. 19, Sept., in the Epistle to the Ephesians, with reference to

One or two passages additional to this one from the Psalms have been cited, for a similar purpose, by individual writers who have discussed the subject. Thus Prof. Grimm, in an article in the *Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie* for 1868–9, refers to the Apoc. Psalms of Solomon, viii. 40, 41, where we find *αἰνετὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὁσίων, καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος Ἰσραὴλ ὑπὸ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* Gen. xxvii. 29 is mentioned in a note appended to Prof. Andrews Norton's *Statement of Reasons.* Here the words are *ὁ καταρώμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος· ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε, εὐλογημένος.* It will be observed that, in both of these cases, we have double sentences, and consequently sentences in which we may discover peculiarities as distinguished from simple ones. The former of the two, though not precisely similar to Ps. lxvii. 20, may be explained in the same way. There is, indeed, a kind of chiasmus here. As for the second, the same idea is repeated several times in the Old Testament, *e. g.* Gen. xii. 3, *εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι,* Ps. cviii. 28, LXX., *καταράσονται αὐτοὶ καὶ σὺ εὐλογήσεις,* Num., xxiv. 9, *οἱ εὐλογοῦντές σε εὐλόγηνται καὶ οἱ καταρώμενοί σε κεκατήρανται.* The examination of these verses will show that the writers seem to labor, in all possible ways, to bring out what we may call the compound emphasis. The object, in all this effort, is the same which, in a single clause, is reached in one way only. The compound sentence, therefore, ceases to be a parallel to the simple one. It involves other and peculiar elements, and hence may be subject to special rules appertaining to itself alone.

As a case where, *in a single clause,* the usual order is reversed, Gen. xxvi. 29, has been referred to. The reading here in the common text of the LXX. is *καὶ νῦν εὐλογημένος σὺ ὑπὸ κυρίου,* but according to some of the manuscripts it is *σὺ εὐλογητός.* The correct text is so uncertain as to make the evidence to be derived from it somewhat doubtful. But, accepting the reading which places the subject first,

Christ. But there we find an evident citation. Here, on the contrary, there is nothing to remind us of the precise words of the Psalm. Can we infer from the fact that in another letter, written four or five years afterwards to another Church, there is an application of a particular Psalm to our Lord, that there is, also, such an application in this letter, when the Psalm itself is not quoted? St. Paul, in addressing the Ephesians, is speaking of another subject, he is presenting the exaltation of Christ with reference to another end, he is employing different expressions, he is calling the attention of his readers directly to the O. T. words. The argument derived from what he says to them can scarcely be of much force as bearing upon his language here.

we think it may be questioned whether the sentence is an exclamatory one, pronouncing Isaac blessed, and is not rather an affirmative one, giving a reason why the speakers had come to him for the purpose of making a covenant. If it is to be interpreted in the latter way, it does not belong in the doxological class.

We will not dwell upon the supposed exceptional cases further. To prove that there is not even a single one within the limits of the Greek language, may be difficult. But certainly the search for them has not been an easy task, and, when the search has seemed to be rewarded by a discovery, the passage which is found has some peculiar characteristics rendering it hardly serviceable for the end in view. We may say, at least, that the cases are so exceedingly rare, that, when we are moving in our argument, as we are now, within the region of probabilities, and not affirming certainties, they afford little strength as opposing the ground which we have taken.

Winer (see his N. T. Grammar, p. 551, Am. ed.) sets aside this whole matter of seeking for exceptional cases or denying their existence. He says, "Only an empirical expositor could regard this position as an unalterable rule; for when the subject constitutes the principal notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxvii. 20, Sept. And so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words, ὁ ὤν, &c., are referred to God, the position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispensable." Other writers have maintained substantially the same ground. It will be convenient, in continuing our discussion, to make these remarks of Winer the starting point for a few suggestions.

(*a.*) We may admit that the rule of arrangement is that of emphasis. But the question before us is, in fact, this: Whether in such doxological passages, having an exclamatory character, the doxological word is not necessarily the emphatic one. The decision of this question may not, indeed, be reached by the mere empirical expositor. But, if not, is he not, after all, working along a line of examination which ought to be followed? Is not the determination of universal usage a most important, not to say the conclusive, thing? If all writers pursue the same course, does not their unanimous action carry with it the greatest weight, and show that there must be some ground in the nature of things for their unanimity?

(*b.*) But, passing this point, let us look at Winer's more particular positions. These are that the doxological word *may*, and that it even *must*, stand after the subject, provided the subject constitutes the principal notion, and especially when it is antithetical to another subject. That the word *must*, in this statement, cannot be sustained, is, we

think, proved by such instances as LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 Kings xxv. 32, 33, where we have contrasted subjects, and, in the latter case, the σύ (vs. 33.) is the "principal notion" because of the clause ἡ ἀποκωλύσασα, etc., which contains the very ground and substance of the whole exclamation. As for the word *may*, on the other hand, it is, to say the least, not justified by Winer's cited example, Ps. lxvii. 20; for, whatever else may be said of the passage, it presents no such peculiar prominence of the subject. There seems to be no evidence of any prominence at all in the subject, except the mere fact of the arrangement of the words. But to assume that this fact proves it, is, in the first place, to assume the very point in dispute, and in the second place, to assume that no other reason can be given for the peculiar order.

(*c.*) Without, however, pressing this question of *may* and *must*, we ask what is the prominence of the subject in Rom. ix. 5, which renders it in such a degree the principal notion, that its position before the doxological word is not only "quite appropriate," as Winer maintains, but "even indispensable?" It must be, if we are guided by his paragraph quoted above, either (*x.*) because of a contrast with something else in the passage,—which, it would seem, is either Christ or the Israelites, or (*y.*) because God is designated as the author of the blessings and privileges mentioned in this verse and the preceding one, and that this authorship is the principal thought or notion. With reference to *x.* we should say that there is no such contrast here, and that, if there were, there are passages of sufficient number in the Old Testament, in which, while the contrast is much more marked and striking, the doxological word keeps its regular position at the beginning of the clause, to show that the Biblical writers did not reverse the order in such cases, or regard the fact of a contrast as having any influence towards a reversal. Compare, for example, LXX. Gen. xiv. 19, 20, 1 Kings xxv. 32, 33, already referred to; and, as furnishing quite as much of contrast as can possibly be found in Rom. ix. 5, LXX. Ps. lxxxviiii; 53, whether we consider the contrast as with the enemies or the anointed, τοῦ χριστοῦ σου, (Ps.) the Israelites or Christ, (Rom.). In respect to *y.*, we should maintain that there are passages in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, where the subject is clearly and emphatically the principal notion—as much so as it is in our present verse—in which the writer, nevertheless, places it after the doxological word. Compare 2 Macc. xv. 34, as a marked instance. In this verse, as we see in view of the context, the chief idea, and the point and force of the offering of praise to God, are found in the words ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμίαντον, as they

are in *ὁ ὤν*, etc., according to Winer's statement, in Rom. ix. 5. It is *the great act*, there as much as here, and so, we think, in LXX. 1 Kings xxv. 33, and elsewhere, which calls forth the doxology, and yet no change in the order is made.*

(*d.*) If it be said that these cases, and others which might be mentioned, do not correspond with the one now under discussion, because the name of the subject is here *preceded* by a descriptive clause, *ὁ ὤν*, etc., which marks the subject as the principal notion, it must be admitted that there is no passage in the Septugaint precisely corresponding, in this respect, with the present one. Can we believe, however, that, if in Ps. lxxi. 18, Sept. for example, which now reads *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια μόνος*, the writer had wished to use only the phrase *ὁ ποιῶν θαυμάσια θεός*, instead of the words which he does use, he would have been compelled, or, so far as we can judge, would have been disposed, to place *εὐλογητός* after it? Or, again, would it have been necessary to vary, in this respect, the order of the sentence in Ps. cxvii. 26 Sept., if to the clause, as it now reads, *εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου* the writer had desired to add words such as *χριστὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*? It is true that the doxologies in the Septuagint which introduce the word *εὐλογητός* have, in all cases, the name of the subject immediately following this word, and, if a descriptive or causal clause occurs, it is added with *ὅτι* or *ὅς* and a verb, or with *ὁ* and a participle. But this fact seems to point, not so much to an impossibility of placing such a descriptive phrase, consisting of *ὁ* and a participle, before the name of the subject in such a sentence, but rather to the probability that, if St. Paul had wished to insert a doxology here, he would have adopted the course of the LXX. translators, and would have written *εὐλογητός* first, *θεός* in the second place, and then a participial clause with *ὅ*, or a verbal one with *ὅς* or *ὅτι*. The argument, thus, is rather unfavorable than favorable to the supposition that the Apostle's words are designed to be an ascription of praise to God the Father.

* As the doxological clause in 2 Macc. xv. 34 follows the verb *εὐλόγησαν* (*οἱ δὲ πάντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον, λέγοντες*), it may, perhaps, be claimed that this verb requires the emphasis in the doxology to be on *εὐλογητός*. If we admit this—which may be regarded as doubtful, to say the least,—we may, nevertheless, confidently affirm, from the unvarying usage of the Septuagint, that the same arrangement of words would have been given, if the verb in question had not been in the text; and the passage remains, therefore, as a suitable one for the purpose for which it is here used.

(*e.*) But if Rom. ix. 5, is a passage in which the writer desired to set forth a peculiar emphasis in relation to the subject, such as surpasses that which was aimed at in any doxological verse of the Old Testament; if this emphasis was to be connected with God's authorship of the blessings which had been given to Israel; and if the end was sought by placing the descriptive clause not merely before the name of the subject, but also before the doxological word; we cannot but think that he would have written, not what we have before us, but τῷ δὲ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, (or, with another order, τῷ δὲ θεῷ τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων ὄντι δόξα, etc.). He would have adopted this course, we think, for two reasons: *first*, because the almost or quite universal usage in such exclamatory doxologies, (as we see in all the Scriptural writers), would have led him to apprehend a possible misunderstanding of the clause, if put in its present form,—we say this, of course, on the verbal and grammatical side, not on the doctrinal, —and *secondly*, because the form of expression with the dative was well known to him and frequently used in his epistles, and, indeed, the most common form at the end of his paragraphs, while at the same time it would, if employed, be unmistakable in its meaning.

(*f.*) Before closing our remarks on this part of the subject, we would call attention to one further point. Meyer and some others maintain that the doxological passages in the LXX. which have the copula are, in no essential point, different from those which have not, so far forth as the matter now in hand is concerned. Hence they claim that all passages of this class, in which the subject precedes εὐλογημένος, are pertinent as bearing upon our present verse. The εἴη or γένοιτο or ἔστω in such sentences, it is affirmed, has no emphasis, and the position of the other words is determined by the fact that the stress falls rather upon the subject than the predicate. The passages of this character are the following: Ruth ii. 19, 2 Chron. ix. 8, Job i. 21, Ps. lxxi. 17, Ps. cxii. 2, Dan. ii. 20. A careful examination of these verses, in connection and comparison with others in which εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος occurs without the copula, will show, we are confident, that there is no evidence that the subject has any more prominence in the one case than in the other. Compare LXX. Ps. lxxi, 17, for example, where we have ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, with the same Psalm, verse 19, where the words are εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. It is worthy of notice that, in all these cases, the Hebrew reads the verb, the subject and the doxological word in the same order,* while in the passages of the other class the doxological word

*In Ps. lxxii. (LXX. lxxi.) 17, the Hebrew omits the word *blessed:* "Let his name be for ever."

is always placed first. Is not the true explanation of the matter the following: namely, that the LXX. translators strictly rendered the Hebrew in both classes of sentences, and that both the Hebrew and Septuagint writers obeyed a natural law of language; the law that, in exclamatory doxologies of this character, the doxological word holds the first position, but, where a copula is introduced, the doxological word may follow the subject—even as we say, in English, Happy is the man, but, Let the man be happy, although the subject is no more prominent, or the principal notion, in the one case than in the other.

We may remark here again, that the argument seems to be cumulative. The probability arising from the position of εὐλογητός, strong in itself, is strengthened still further by its connection with ὁ ὤν,—by the naturalness, that is, with which it is taken as a predicate after ὤν;—and especially in view of the fact that in the other two instances in which we have similar expressions in the Pauline Epistles, (Rom. i. 25, and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate; in the former after ὅς ἐστιν, in the latter after ὁ ὤν.

IV. The phrase ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων is, we think, more readily referred to Christ, in this connection, than to God, because, as descriptive of the exaltation and glory of Christ, ἐπὶ πάντων is a very natural and suitable phrase, (as *e. g.* in Eph. iv. 6, with reference to the Father), but, as setting forth the fact that God's superintending providence had allotted to the Israelites such blessings, it seems clear that some other expression would have been better adapted to convey the thought. Some other expression would, therefore, probably have been employed. That ἐπὶ πάντων *cannot* be used as relating to God in view of the thought of this context, we would not affirm, as some have been disposed to do. But the balance of probability is in favor of the other reference.

It has been asserted, indeed, that ὤν would have been omitted, if the Apostle had intended to speak of God. We doubt the propriety of this assertion. ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός and ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός are phrases which do not, or at least may not, have precisely the same meaning. St. Paul here, according to the rendering of the sentence which is proposed for the marginal note by the American Revisers, says, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever." For this expression the language used is perfectly fitted, and more so than ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός would be. We think it may be said in this connection, however, that there is a somewhat greater naturalness in the use of the words ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as compared with ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, or even ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ὢν θεός, if the reference be to Christ.

Many writers have further claimed, that, if the clause were designed to be a doxology, a particle like δέ would be inserted at the beginning, so that it would read ὁ δὲ ὤν, etc. No doubt this is the common construction in such cases, and therefore there is a certain degree of probability, by reason of this fact, against the doxological interpretation here. But it must be remembered that St. Paul is a writer whose style is marked often by abrupt transitions. In the sentences of such a writer, particles of this sort may easily be omitted. The ardor of his feeling is manifested, at times, by the abruptness, and the emphasis is made stronger. A clear case of the omission of δέ under such circumstances may be found in 2 Cor. ix. 15, if we adopt the reading favored by the oldest manuscripts and approved by the best textual scholars.

In regard to the phrase now under consideration we may say that, at each point to which we have referred, there is a slight balance, at least, in favor of uniting it with χριστός. There is no difficulty as appertaining to the language used, if the words are taken as descriptive of Christ. The absence of δέ, the position of ὤν, and the ἐπὶ πάντων constitute reasons of some, even if it be but little, weight, as bearing against the independence of the clause and its separation from the preceding words.

We have, thus, examined the several parts of the passage which have any important bearing upon the decision as to its meaning: ὁ ὤν —ἐπὶ πάντων—εὐλογητός—τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. They, each and all, afford a probability that the clause relates to Christ. They point in one direction; and this wholly apart from doctrinal considerations,—in the region of language and grammar alone. We cannot say, indeed, that any one of these phrases presents an absolutely conclusive argument on this side of the question. Nor can we maintain, since a chain is no stronger than its links, that all the phrases, when taken together, constitute such an argument, or determine the reference to God to be *impossible*. At the same time, there is, if we may so express it, *a combined and compounded probability*, the force of which cannot easily be shaken, as it seems to us, and should not fail to be duly considered.

V. Beyond the words of the individual clause, their meaning and connection, there is one further point which deserves particular notice. The relation of the clause to the entire context may have an important influence in determining the intention of the author when he wrote it. In which direction does the context turn the balance of

probability? We think, towards the same reference, to which, as we have already seen, the words direct us. The antecedent presumption from the surrounding verses is against a doxology to God in this place. Some have held that this presumption amounts to certainty. The introduction of such a doxology here, they assert, would be so unsuitable as to render it quite impossible to suppose that the Apostle could have thought of it for a moment. To us, however, this view appears to be quite without foundation. Indeed, we cannot regard an ascription of praise to God as *especially* out of place at this point. St. Paul had been enumerating the peculiar blessings and honors of his own people, which had given them, as he rejoiced to feel, an exalted position in the world. He was declaring his affection for them, and the absence of all enmity even when compelled to say what might seem harsh and offensive. He was testifying to his sorrow for evil which befell them, and his joy and pride in all their history as evidencing God's favor. These are the thoughts of the first five verses of this chapter. Why could he not, and why should he not, at the close of these verses, and after the enumeration of these blessings, break forth into the exclamation, "May he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever!" But, while we admit this, we must observe that the progress of the author's thought is towards the sixth verse and what follows it, and that the balance of probability cannot be determined without considering the five verses in connection with the sixth and the rest of the chapter. As we look at the matter from this point of view, we find that the thought moves on in an easy and natural way, if we make the reference of these words, which are under discussion, to be to Christ. As I come now, (the Apostle says in substance), after my preceding argument and discourse to speak of the lapse of the Jews, I assure them that I do it with sorrow, not with willingness; for how could I do it willingly, since they are my own countrymen, and are the people who have been honored by the possession of the law, etc., and by the fact that the *Divine* Christ entered into our world as one of their race;—and I assure them also (vs. 6), that, in saying what I am compelled to say, I do not mean that the covenant of God, which has given them all these blessings, has failed or will fail. I only say, that it has been misapprehended in its true meaning and application by my countrymen. Understood in this way, everything becomes clear; the emphasis throughout is just what we should anticipate; the relation of the introductory verses to the main portion of the chapter is most appropriate and most simple. If, on the other hand, we have a doxology at the end of the fifth verse, there is a certain arresting of the

thought and drawing aside of the mind, which, in a measure, breaks the closeness of the connection. Now, as the chapter is not written for the sake of the introduction, but the introduction for the sake of the chapter, it would seem that we ought to explain these verses, in every part of them, in the way which will place them most in harmony with what follows.

VI. If the considerations thus far presented are of weight, and the argument is, in some degree, cumulative as it proceeds, we may properly notice the fact before closing, that the writers of the Primitive Church, so far as they refer to this passage, seem almost uniformly to give the interpretation which applies the words to Christ. The value of patristic interpretation may be questioned, indeed, and in the case of some of the fathers it is possible that reasons may be suggested which influenced their minds, apart from the mere language which is used by the Apostle. But, whatever may be said in this way, and however we may estimate these writers, their substantial or complete unanimity is a circumstance which should not be disregarded. We do not insist on this point with urgency, because we cannot look upon it as having so much importance as it has appeared to many to have. As connected with and following upon what has been previously presented, however, we give the fact a place in the argument which we think it deserves.

We thus bring our presentation of the subject, so far as this side of the argument is concerned, to a close. There are considerations upon the other side, which demand notice, if our discussion is to be complete, or if it is to be carried forward with impartiality. To these we now turn our attention.

I. Looking simply at the matter of language—and apart from all doctrinal controversy—we see, it is said, that St. Paul does not use the word θεός, in any single instance unless it be here, with reference to Christ. This word is found in the Pauline Epistles about five hundred and fifty times. If among all these cases no one is discovered in which Christ is called θεός, outside of the verse before us, what is the inference as to this verse? Is it not, manifestly, that he is not so called here? The advocates of the interpretation which makes the clause a doxology to God press this question with much emphasis and confidence. They claim that the presumption in favor of their view, and against the application of the words to Christ, becomes at this point overwhelming; that it overbalances, indeed, everything which has been or can be urged upon the other side.

Estimate this presumption, however, as fairly as we may, it must be admitted, we think, as has been already said with respect to some of those mentioned upon the other side, that it does not amount to certainty. Certainty, in this connection, could come only from a positive statement on the part of the Apostle, or, at least, of some writer in the New Testament, that Christ is not θεός. But no such statement exists. It must also be admitted, we think, that, in and of itself, it does not reach the highest limits of probability, for if in our study of his writings we find, perchance, indications that divine attributes are ascribed by St. Paul to Christ, this fact may open the way for our believing that he somewhere calls him God. Or if the sentence before us, on investigation, proves to present some difficulties in the meaning of words or in construction, which are equally great with any involved in supposing that the Apostle here deviates from his uniform custom elsewhere, we must weigh these difficulties in the balance with this presumption, in order to our reaching our final result.

So much may be said, even if there are no instances of this use of θεός to be discovered. But in case our examination leads to the finding of a few such instances, the argument now before us will, evidently, lose much, if not all, of its force. The presumption will sink into a far lower region of probability. This will be so, because the present sentence if interpreted of Christ will, under these circumstances, be no longer distinguished from every other Pauline sentence. It will be so, also, because, as it is antecedently to be expected that the word θεός will generally be applied to God the Father, even a small number of examples of reference to Christ may justify us in assuming such a reference, wherever the indications of the sentence itself point in that direction. We are brought, therefore, to the inquiry whether any such cases, which are in point, actually exist, or whether any considerations may properly be offered which tend to weaken or set aside the argument now before us.

The full and satisfactory examination in regard to the use of the word θεός would involve a discussion of all the verses, in which it has been maintained that St. Paul applies it to Christ. Such a discussion, however, would reach far beyond the limits of this paper. We can only indicate, as briefly as possible, a few points which may have a bearing upon the true view of the subject, and may help towards showing precisely what the strength or weaknesss of the presumption asserted to exist here is. These points are the following:

(*a.*) In Acts xx. 28, the textual evidence is so strong in favor of θεοῦ that it is accepted as the true reading by prominent scholars, and

among them by Westcott and Hort, in their recently published edition of the Greek Testament. The English Revisers have retained the word *God* in their text. It must be admitted by all, that this may have been the original word, and that the other reading, κυρίου, cannot be considered as certainly to be substituted. The question, to say the most we can for that other reading, is nearly evenly balanced. Here, then, is one instance where we find a not improbable justification for explaining our present passage as having reference to Christ.

(*b.*) In Titus ii. 13, the arguments which are connected with the natural construction of the verse, favor the reference of θεοῦ to Christ. The ordinary grammatical rule, according to which two appellative words connected by καί under a common article belong to the same substantive, points to this application of the word. That this rule is universal, is denied. That it holds with regard to the verse in question, is not admitted by Winer and some others. The suggestions of Winer, however, in support of his view do not seem to be conclusive, when they are examined, and we are persuaded that the grounds for applying the rule in this verse have not been duly considered by most of those who have written upon the subject. The English Revisers, here also, have given in their text the rendering which assigns the name *God* to Christ.

(*c.*) The other verses from the Pauline Epistles which have been cited for the purpose of showing that this name is thus given, such as Col. ii. 2, Eph. v. 5, 2 Thess. i. 12, Tit. i. 3, we regard as having, according to the probabilities of the case, another interpretation. We, therefore, mention them only that it may not be supposed they have been overlooked, but do not rest the argument, in any measure, upon them. The first two of them, not to say all, may possibly be instances in point, but the possibility does not seem to reach the limits of probability. 1 Tim. iii. 16, can hardly be cited at all, since the true text is ὅς, not θεός, as the best critics now generally admit.

(*d.*) Whatever may be the final decision with regard to any or all of these passages, St. Paul unquestionably uses very strong expressions respecting Christ, which bear Him to an exaltation closely approaching to that which would be indicated by giving Him the name θεός, if, indeed, they do not fully reach it;—especially in Phil. ii. 6–8 and Col. ii. 9. He who "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God," and in whom "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," would seem to be worthy of the loftiest title. He has θεότης abiding in him; may he not somewhere be called θεός?

(*e.*) The Apostle John uses the word θεός of Christ in his Gospel, i. 1, xx. 28. If this be admitted, we must allow that the thought of

Christ as God was not foreign to the apostolic mind, and therefore, that it may not have been strange to Paul. We may notice, also, that St. John, though using this word about one hundred and fifty times, applies it to Christ only twice, or, if xx. 28, is excluded, only once. We find, thus, a fact in connection with his writings, which corresponds, in its measure, with what we see in St. Paul's Epistles, if Rom. ix. 5 is the only instance of his employing θεός in this way.

(f.) This brings us to what we regard as an important suggestion, as relating to the matter now before us. If St. Paul and the other Apostles believed that the word θεός was properly applicable to Christ, it is, nevertheless, not strange that they should have spoken of him scores or hundreds of times as man, or as Messiah, while referring to him only in occasional instances as God. It was to be expected, on the other hand, that this would be their course. Their work, to which they devoted their energy and life, was, as we must remember, to persuade their fellow men to accept as a Savior the *man* who had taught them, whose disciples they had been during His earthly ministry, and whom they had seen after His resurrection and as he ascended towards heaven. The question whether he was God or not, however important in itself, was, in this view, a secondary and subordinate one. Those writers who have asserted that, if the New Testament authors had accepted the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, they would have declared it on every page, misapprehend, as it appears to us, the position of these authors and the first and main object which they had in view. As they besought those to whom they preached the Gospel to be reconciled to God, they set before them the Mediator through whom the reconciliation was made possible. They naturally described him in this official and intermediate relation, as he appeared on earth. They wrote about him as they preached, mainly in his distinction from God and in his human manifestation, and only in a far less degree did they feel impelled to discourse of his union in being with God, or to give him the name of God. It was Jesus, whom they preached. If men would come in faith to Jesus, they believed that they would gradually, if not at once, reach the apprehension that he was Divine. They called him, therefore, Jesus, Christ, Saviour, Mediator, Man, often and always. They called him God only here and there,—only, it may be, at very rare intervals.

The argument now under consideration is, in our judgment, the strongest one which can be brought forward against the reference of the clause before us to Christ. To those who present it, it appears conclusive. But, even if we admit that none of the passages cited from the Pauline writings prove that θεός is used of him, the points

to which we have called attention are, as it appears to us, of much importance. They show that, at the most, very few instances of such use are to be looked for, under any circumstances. They show, also, that St. Paul does not hesitate to employ expressions, which are little short of what this verse would mean, if interpreted as declaring that Christ is God. And, further, they show that one of the other Apostles makes this declaration, with the use of this word, only in one or two places, though he applies the word to God the Father as many times as Paul does in proportion to the extent of his writings. When we bear all this in mind, and remember that the naturalness of the construction in every part of the sentence points to the reference to Christ, the deviation from the Apostle's usual or uniform custom ceases to be so strange as it has been judged to be. Few passages in his Epistles, we must remember also, give a more fitting occasion than this for setting forth this exaltation.

II. It is urged as bearing against the reference of the words under discussion to Christ, that doxologies ascribing praise to him are not found in the Apostolic writings. On this point it may be said, (*a.*) that Rev. i, 6, v. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 18, are clear instances of doxologies to Christ. 2 Tim. iv. 18, is, also, another instance according to the view of commentators in general. Unless all these cases are set aside by denying the apostolic authorship of the books, the argument must be regarded as having no foundation. (*b.*) 1. Pet. iv. 11, and Heb. xiii. 21, are passages in which such doxologies may possibly be found. If so,—the former is from a book whose author was, in all probability, an apostle. We do not, however, press these cases in the discussion, for we consider them as referring, most probably, not to Christ, but to God the Father. (*c*) But, whatever may be the result of our search for examples, it is clear that the Apostles speak in the most exalted language of Christ. St. Paul himself unites him with God the Father, in the Apostolic Benediction. He calls him the Lord of glory; the image of God; the Lord from heaven; the Lord of the living and the dead; God's own Son. He represents him as before all things; as the one through whom are all things; as sustaining all things; as having a name that is above every name; as the one to whom all things in heaven and earth and under the earth are to bow. He declares that he was in the form of God; that he is now at the right hand of God; that in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; and that he is raised far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come. That one who

says all this should somewhere pass the limits of ordinary language, and even call him *God*, would hardly surprise us. It would seem to be no more than a fit description of his glory. But much more may we regard it as quite consistent for such a writer, in a passage like Rom. ix. 5, to use a word ascribing to him *praise and blessing*, even if no instance can be found where a *formal doxology* occurs. There are not more than ten such doxologies, it may be noticed, in all the Pauline Epistles. There are only two, (2 Cor. i. 3, Eph. i. 3.) where this word εὐλογητός is used.

III. But not merely is the doxological character of the sentence made a ground of rejecting the appplication of it to Christ. The word εὐλογητός itself is not used anywhere in the New Testament as relating to him; and this circumstance is adduced to show the improbability that he is referred to here. The facts with regard to this matter are these. There are but seven instances of the use of this word, outside of the present verse, in the entire New Testament. There are but four in St. Paul's Epistles. The kindred word εὐλογημένος, occurs in only eleven cases, and six or seven of these are mere repetitions of a single quotation from the Psalms. In this repeated citation and in one other passage, εὐλογημένος, which is elsewhere used of human beings, is applied to Christ. In Mark xiv. 61, on the other hand, Christ is called "the Son of the Blessed;" ὁ εὐλογητός being employed as a designation of God. With respect to these facts we may remark, (*a.*) that the number of examples of the use of εὐλογητός seems insufficient to determine usage as invariable,—to the exclusion of even an individual case; (*b.*) that the application of εὐλογημένος, (as distinguished from εὐλογητός), to Christ in six repetitions of an Old Testament verse can scarcely prove that a writer could not make use of the other word in a seventh instance, if he should desire to do so; (*c.*) that the two words are found in the Old Testament referring both to God and men, with a somewhat greater freedom than we discover in the very few passages occurring in the New Testament; (*d.*) that, in the case cited from Mark's Gospel, the language is that of the Jewish High Priest who was evidently referring to the declarations of Jesus, that He was the Son of God; and that we cannot fairly conclude from this phrase as thus employed, that, to the Apostolic mind, εὐλογητός was an inappropriate word to apply to Christ; (*e.*) and, finally, that,—considering the very limited amount of evidence which can be brought forward respecting this word, as found in the New Testament books,—the fact that in the only two places similar to the one now under consideration, in which St. Paul uses the word,

(namely Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31), it is a predicate descriptive of the subject, is deserving of special notice.

IV. The distinction made between God and Christ in 1 Cor. viii. 6. and Eph. iv. 5, 6, is urged as inconsistent with the interpretation of the clause before us as referring to Christ. Undoubtedly, a distinction is set forth in those verses. But it does not seem to follow from this fact, necessarily, that a similar distinction must be made here. If we suppose Christ to be θεός, it cannot be regarded as impossible, or even improbable, that an Apostle should desire at one time to speak of God and Christ in their separate positions and relations, and at another should wish to describe Christ in himself alone. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose, that, in the former case, he should represent Christ as κύριος, and God the Father as θεός, adding ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, as Paul does in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that, in the latter, he should say of Christ ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, as in Rom. ix. 5. That the verses cited have no bearing on the question, we would not affirm. They suggest a certain degree of probability, that the present verse ought to be interpreted as they must be. But we cannot regard them as having any considerable weight, because, on the supposition just made, it becomes so easy to explain the different cases on different grounds, and, thus, to show that they may have no complete parallelism.

The points which we have presented on this side of the question, like those on the other side which were previously stated, are in the region of language and its use by the Apostle, and not in that of doctrine. We legitimately investigate the writings of an author and try to determine what his usage is, if we are in doubt respecting the significance or the application of words in a particular passage. So we ordinarily do in the case of a classical Greek writer. So we may, with equal propriety, do when interpreting St. Paul's Epistles. If we find, on such investigation, that he never uses θεός elsewhere as applied to Christ; that he never employs the word εὐλογητός when speaking of him; that doxologies to Christ are not discoverable in his writings; and that, in certain noticeable passages where a distinction is made between him and the Father, the Father only is called ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων ; it will scarcely be denied that all these things, when taken together, present a strong probability that a passage which involves these several words and expressions is not a description of Christ, but a doxology to God the Father. We have seen, however, as we think, that, with regard to the last three of these points, the impression

which the first statement of them may make upon the mind, is diminished in its force, not to say entirely removed, when we come to consider them more carefully. We may argue usage from five hundred examples with some reason, but from four cases in which Paul has εὐλογητός, or ten doxologies all referring to God, we cannot infer a rule of language, from which he could nowhere deviate for what seemed to him sufficient grounds. He certainly sets forth Christ as worthy of glory and honor, if he does not put his words in the form of an ordinary doxology. He does put them in this form, if the passage in the Second Epistle to Timothy, already cited, is allowed as referring to Christ and as written by the Apostle. Moreover, the distinction made between Christ and God in a few passages does not force us to the conclusion that there may not be a union between them, so that, when the former point is before the mind, one Lord and one God are mentioned apart, but, when the other thought is prominent, the one Lord receives the Divine name, which belongs to him as Divine.

We are left, therefore, for the main support of the position assumed upon this side of the question in dispute, to the first of the four arguments presented,—namely, that with reference to the word θεός. The force of this argument, we think we may justly say, is very greatly weakened by the suggestions which have been already made respecting it. We are not disposed to deny, however, that it is deserving of careful consideration on the part of all who, in their study of the passage, honestly seek for the truth.

It will be noticed as a somewhat singular fact, as we review these several grounds which are rested upon by the advocates of the reference of the words to God the Father, that they are all connected with and derived from the general usage of the Apostle. They are, thus, brought to bear upon the meaning of the passage from sources which are outside of it. The grounds, on the other hand, which those allege who would make the sentence descriptive of Christ, fall within the limits of the construction of the passage itself. Arguments of both sorts are legitimate, and may be of great value and great strength. But in general, as we think, those which belong to the words themselves, as they stand before us, will carry with them the greater weight, because a writer may turn aside from his ordinary usage, or even start a new one, in some particular sentence. What a writer's usage is, we determine only by the observation of a certain number of known cases. Whether in a new and hitherto unobserved case he accords with what we have found elsewhere, depends on the possibilities or the probabilities of the phenomena presented by

it (that is, its own words and the rules of construction), and on the reasons which may have easily influenced him at the time of writing.

In the present case, all the arguments which are founded upon the probabilities of construction, and of the meaning of individual words, point towards interpreting the sentence as referring to Christ. These arguments, also, grow in strength as we pass from one to another, for each new one seems to gain something from its connection with those which precede it. Combined in their force, they press us to the conclusion that this is the correct interpretation. We find them opposed by only one, which stands the test of examination. This one, like all which are brought forward in union with it, is derived from the alleged unvarying custom of the Apostle elsewhere, to use a particular word or phrase in a particular way. But, considering all that has been said respecting this word, as connected with the exalted idea of Christ which the Apostle sets forth in language bearing the highest meaning, this argument does not seem to meet the full force of those which it opposes. It leaves the mind of the student or reader, therefore, to follow the pathway to which they point, and, thus, to interpret as the English text reads: "of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

At the same time, so long as this argument from usage retains any considerable measure of its weight, the candid scholar must feel, we think, that a marginal rendering ought to be given. The English reader should, by this means, be put in possession of the knowledge of the fact, that the Greek words may possibly have another meaning —that they *may* refer not to Christ, but to the Father. The Revisers on both sides of the ocean have only been faithful to the demands laid upon them, as they have introduced such a marginal rendering into their amended version. It is idle to say, as a distinguished English writer and bishop has recently done, that the translation which makes these words a doxology to God the Father is "a mere evasion of acute minds, occupied by dogmatic prepossessions against the Divinity of Jesus." The discussion of the subject in this paper has been wholly in the field of language and grammar. It has occupied itself with the meaning of words, the construction of sentences, and the usage of the writer; and with these things only. But it has shown that there is an uncertainty in the very form of expression which the Apostle here uses, and that the clause allows two different explanations. It has shown, also, that these have just grounds on which to claim attention.

The question ceases to be one of certainties, and becomes one of probabilities. The probabilities turn towards the reference to Christ, indeed, if our argument has been correct, but not so completely and overwhelmingly as to make it right to ignore the other view altogether. In their Preface to the Revised Version the Revisers say, "We have placed before the reader in the margin other renderings than those which were adopted in the text, wherever such renderings seemed to deserve consideration." The rule for their action was the only proper one for them to adopt. Their insertion of a marginal note at this verse was in accordance with a proper application of the rule.

If, now, we regard it as established that the text of the Revised Version gives that interpretation of the passage which, by its greater probability, deserves to be preferred, and yet that some form of words setting forth the other meaning should be added in the margin, the question arises as to what this form should be. Should it be that which the American Revision Company have suggested, or one, or indeed all, of those presented by the English Company? A few words in answer to this inquiry seem to be required.

There are two points here, which deserve to be noticed. The first has reference to the words which introduce the marginal rendering. The English Revisers have deviated here from their universal custom elsewhere, and have attributed the translations which they record in their margin to "some modern interpreters." This appears to us improper for two reasons: (*a.*) because the ground on which the rendering of the text throughout the New Testament is preferred, or that on which a marginal interpretation is added, is not that ancient writers have favored it, but that fidelity to truth demands it; and (*b.*) because the insertion of these words *in this place alone* is calculated to give the ordinary reader an impression that the early fathers were better interpreters than modern scholars, which is not in accordance with the facts of the case. If this verse calls for an alternate rendering at all, it calls for it on similar grounds to those which occasion other alternate renderings, and it ought to be introduced, as all others are, by *Or.* The American suggestion, so far as this point is concerned, is surely the proper and right one.

The second point has reference to the different modes of translating, if we refer the clause to God. The English present three modes, two which place a period after *flesh;* and one which puts a comma after *flesh*, and a period after *all.* The renderings, then, are, as mentioned at the beginning of this paper:

(*a.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever.

(*b.*) Of whom, &c. He who is over all is God blessed for ever.

(*c.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever.

The American body propose to substitute for all these a fourth form:

(*d.*) Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.

Of these four forms which one deserves to be preferred? The fourth, as it seems to us. Let us compare it with each of the others; and, in the first place, with (*c.*). It must be admitted that (*c.*) has two advantages, as contrasted with (*d.*)—namely, it allows the natural and easy connection of ὁ ὤν with χριστός, and it affords a contrast to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. But, on the other hand, with this punctuation of the sentence, (1.) the doxology becomes much more abrupt; (2.) it loses all presentation of the ground for its introduction; (3.) it seems to be even less in the line of the Apostle's thought, than if (*d.*) be adopted; (4.) it furnishes no account of the position of εὐλογητός, after the subject; and (5.) it involves a difficulty of some moment in the absence of the article with θεός. For these reasons we think it must be rejected, as being less probably than (*d.*) the true construction, in case the word θεός refers to God the Father.

As compared with (*b.*), it appears to us that (*d.*) is decidedly to be preferred. (*b.*) is rather a formal statement of a fact, "He who is over all is God blessed for ever;" (*d.*) is an expression of feeling, an ascription of praise. The latter is both more in accordance with the course of the author's thought and language in the preceding verses, and is less difficult of explanation so far as the formation of the sentence itself is concerned. In the preceding verses the Apostle has exhibited strong feeling, and has set forth the honors of his own people. To break out into a doxology is not altogether unnatural under the circumstances. To frame his doxology in this form, "May he *who is over all*, God, be blessed forever," is singular, indeed, but not inexplicable. In the ardor of feeling and outburst of praise, he might express his idea of God's providential care and blessing by the words *who is over all.* But if he is framing a proposition and declaring a fact, it scarcely seems probable that he would have used this language, which is certainly not the most appropriate to the thought. He would more naturally, and therefore more probably, have said, *who is the author of these blessings*, or *who has bestowed so much upon Israel.* Moreover, the mere formal statement, that he

who gave the gifts, or he who is over all, is God, seems unnecessary and altogether unlikely to have been made between verse fifth and verse sixth. Any one who will compare the passage with 2 Cor. i. 21, 22, will appreciate, we think, the fitness of the expression there used, and the unfitness of such an expression here.

If, then, the sentence refers to God, it must be regarded, in our judgment, as a doxology in the ordinary and strict sense, *God be blessed*, and the doxology must include all the words, and not θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας only.

But, admitting both of these points, are the words to read as in (*d.*) or as in (*a.*)? We think that here, again, (*d.*) is to have the preference. By adopting (*d.*) we have the sentence in a form which *may possibly* present that emphatic prominence of the subject which is claimed as the reason for placing it before the doxological word. "He who is over all, God," can perhaps describe God as the object of praise because his providential rule has bestowed the blessings. "He who is God over all" is a phrase, on the other hand, more naturally adapted to express the simple idea of God's exaltation and dominion.

The suggestion of the American Revisers, therefore, is the one which seems most deserving of adoption for the marginal note. The interpretation, however, which places the period after πάντων, and connects "who is over all" with Christ,—making the doxology to be *God be blessed for ever*,—may also be worthy of record in the Revision. But this must be considered as doubtful.

We close our paper with two or three remarks not in the immediate line of the argument.

First. It is not vital to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ to find the declaration that he is God in this verse. The Apostle Paul may have believed that his Lord and Saviour was Divine, and may teach this in his Epistles; and yet he may have chosen to limit himself in the use of the name, *God*, so far as to apply it to the Father only. If, then, it be discovered, beyond question, that he never in any single instance uses the word θεός of Christ, the doctrine may still be unshaken. The more careful and systematic study of the New Testament has been showing the Christian Church, in recent times, that its truths are founded less upon individual verses or proof texts, and more upon the great and pervading thought which fills all its books. In this great and pervading thought, as relating to our Lord, we find the declaration of his Divine nature; a declaration which stands fast and abides, though the interpretation of particular

sentences may change as time passes on. If, however, this verse does contain the apostolic testimony that Christ is God, it is a direct affirmation of what the opposite doctrine would deny, and excludes that doctrine altogether.

We may add, in this connection, that, if the doctrine of Christ's divinity be established from other passages or other parts of the New Testament, this fact, by itself, will not prove that θεός here refers to him. It will only add to and confirm the probability derived from the examination of the verse, that it has this reference.

Secondly. The presentation of the subject, which has been made, shows the groundlessness and inappropriateness of the extreme assertions which have been indulged in by advocates of both views of this passage. It has been declared, on the one hand, by those who refer the words to Christ that the rules of construction absolutely exclude any other reference; that doctrinal prejudice alone has been the cause of any denial of this explanation; that there is no ground for such denial which is founded in reason; that it argues mental or moral blindness, even, to support the opposite view. On the other hand, it has been affirmed that the interpretation which does not apply the sentence to God as a doxology is impossible, if the rules and principles of the Greek language are considered; and that it is, indeed, little short of absurd. The fair and unprejudiced consideration of the words draws us away from all such extravagant statements, and brings us to the calm inquiry into the arguments for both sides, and the decision as to the probabilities within the sphere of language and grammatical construction. The presence of the two renderings in the Revised Version, as it comes into general use, will tend to make all theologians and readers recognize that there is a possibility of both renderings, while yet there is a probability that the one given in the text is correct.

Thirdly. It is a fact worthy of notice, that of the most prominent opponents of the reference of the passage to Christ—such writers, for example, as de Wette, Grimm, Rückert, Meyer, Jowett—each one admits a peculiar force as belonging to some particular argument among those which are urged in favor of that reference. Rückert says, that the naturalness of the connection of ὁ ὤν with χριστός points strongly towards this understanding of the clause, and that the sentence moves on most fitly and satisfactorily in this way. de Wette remarks that the demand for a contrast, which is found in τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, is the point of most difficulty to be overcome, and he evidently regards it as of serious moment. Jowett expresses the opinion that the omission of the verb, "the defective and awkward grammar,"

is the strongest objection to the interpretation as a doxology to God. Grimm states that the inappropriateness of using ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, in this connection, with respect to God—that is, as describing his relation to the blessings of the Israelites—is the thing which holds his mind back from applying the phrase to God. Meyer allows the force of everything, as it were, except for the want of instances elsewhere in which the Apostolic writers use θεός of Christ. We cannot but regard the fact that these scholars find a strength in the various arguments, which it is hard to overcome—one looking upon one point as presenting very serious difficulty, and another upon another, until, as we read what is said by them all, we see that they are pressed by the weight of all the considerations—as showing that there is a real force in each one, taken by itself, and a cumulative force in the sum of them, when united together. If such advocates of the opposite view acknowledge that the argument, from stage to stage, causes even themselves to give it their most respectful consideration, the position of those who interpret the clause of Christ must be a strong one, and the reasons which support it must be such as ought to influence candid minds.

We have set forth these reasons and defended this position, with a due estimate as we trust, and with a fair presentation, of what is urged upon the other side. The interpreter is called, by the very duties and obligations of his profession, to be a calm, honest, unprejudiced inquirer after truth—to be a judge, not an interested advocate.